



## ATTACHMENT A

### Remarks

Considering the matters raised in the Office Action in the same order as raised, the Examiner has required restriction between claims 1-12, 14-19 and 28-30, on the one hand, and claims 20-27, on the other. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner contends that the inventions of Group I and Group II are "related as process and apparatus for its practice" and that "the process as claimed can be practiced by hand." It is respectfully submitted that these contentions are not well taken. First, claim 1 recites providing a graphical depiction and displaying the depiction on a display device and thus the method claimed in claim 1 cannot be practiced by hand. Further, and more importantly, claim 29, for example, is a dependent claim directed to an apparatus and recites that the claimed apparatus includes a connector and detecting means for detecting whether a proper connection has been made with the connector. It is respectfully submitted that claim 29 is thus an apparatus claim which is a close counterpart of, e.g., apparatus claim 20, and hence that the reasoning advanced for restricting between Groups I and II clearly does not apply to claim 29 and 20. Similar remarks apply to parent apparatus claim 13 and the other claims dependent thereon.

It is also noted that with respect to the classification of the claims, subclass 43 is indented under subclass 25 in the classification of class 714 so that both subclasses would have to be searched in order to do a complete search of, for example, claim 29. The Examiner has already searched claim 29 so that, presumably, the Examiner has already searched subclass 43.

In summary regarding the requirement for restriction, it is respectfully submitted that this requirement should be withdrawn and claims 20-27 should be examined along with the rest of the claims that have already been examined.

Claim 28 has been objected to because of an informality therein. As indicated below, claim 28 has been cancelled and the subject matter thereof has been incorporated into claim 1. The correction noted by the Examiner has been made in the addition to claim 1, and the Examiner is thanked for pointing out the error in question.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-13, 15, 17-19, 28 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(e) as being "anticipated by" Gettemy. This rejection is respectfully traversed although, as indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 28 therein.

Turning first to claim 1, it is agreed that "Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-20, detecting when the battery falls below a certain predetermined threshold" and that "Gettemy teaches, in column 2, lines 15-25, providing a message that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life." However, while it is also agreed that a message is provided "which informs the user that the display mode on the screen can be changed to enhance battery life," it is respectfully submitted that this message does not provide a solution to correcting the underlying fault. The solution here would be, e.g., to change the battery, whereas merely changing the display simply prolongs the problem of having a weak battery and does not provide a solution to having a weak battery. Further, as indicated above, claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claim 28 and provides that the step of determining a solution "comprises first determining a highly probable solution for correcting said fault condition,

and if said highly probable solution does not correct the fault condition, determining a further solution for correcting said fault condition and providing a further graphical depiction which illustrates said further solution.”

In rejecting the claim 28, the Examiner refers to the lines discussed above (column 2, lines 15-36) and further states that “if the user however doesn’t choose to take this solution the device can automatically make the change for the user if it reaches a lower critical level (see column 7, lines 38-47), further Gettemy teaches in column 9, lines 18-24, the system having an additional battery warning system that provides the user with a critically low battery warning (indicating that it is past the displayed change solution and it is now time to charge).”

It is respectfully submitted that these teachings of Gettemy are not a teaching of the present invention as claimed in amended claim 1. The passage at column 7 merely provides that the electronic device automatically changes to a low power display mode if the user has not yet made a low power selection when the battery level reaches a critical low level. There is no determination of a further solution (the “solution” provided is exactly the same as the previous “solution” but is simply preformed automatically) and there is clearly no provision of a further graphical depiction which illustrates the further solution. With respect to the passage at column 9, this passage merely provides “if the device 100 is in monochrome display mode and the battery energy level of device 100 falls below the critical level, a critically low battery warning may be given to the user.” Again, this is not a determination of a further solution for correcting the fault condition and there is no provision of a further graphical depiction which illustrates the further

solution. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and the claims dependent thereon are clearly patentable over the Gettemy reference.

With respect to claim 8, it is simply not seen that the Gettemy patent discloses providing a help routine including a list of functions that the associated apparatus is capable of performing. Moreover, it is not seen that Gettemy discloses either of the other two steps of claim 8. In the discussion of the rejection of claim 8, the Office Action refers to the same lines of Gettemy as discussed above, and states that these lines teach “providing a message, on the display screen, that allows the user to change the display to prolong battery life.” It is respectfully submitted that this is not a teaching of “providing a help routine including a list of functions an apparatus is capable of performing.” In responding to this argument, the Examiner again refers to the same passage of Gettemy and concludes that this thereby provides “the user with an indication of a help routine to prolong his/her battery life.” Claim 8 specifically claims that the help routine includes a list of functions that an apparatus is capable of performing. No such list is disclosed in Gettemy, and certainly no such list is disclosed in the passages to which the Examiner has referred. Thus, if the Examiner intends to pursue this rejection, a further explanation of how claim 8 is being read on the Gettemy reference is respectfully requested.

With respect to independent claim 18, this claim recites, inter alia, detecting means for detecting a fault condition and a controller that determines a probable solution for correcting the fault condition as well as determines a appropriate graphical depiction of the probable solution. Again, it is respectfully submitted that the Gettemy patent does not disclose a solution for correcting a low battery condition (e.g.,

recharging the battery or replacing the battery) but merely provides for prolonging battery life by switching the selectable display mode.

With respect to dependent claim 30, this claim is similar to cancelled claim 28 and further distinguishes over Gettemy for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1. The other dependent claims grouped in this rejection are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of the claims parent thereto.

Claims 3, 6, 16 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being "unpatentable over" the Gettemy and Kim patents. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the lines of the Kim patent to which reference has been made in the Office Action, Kim provides for displaying a pictorial image on a screen "in either the state the input video signal has been disabled or the state where the video signal has been connected from an external computer system." It is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching in the Kim patent of providing a pictorial depiction of a solution to correcting these problems. This is evident from the lines cited in the Office Action as well as the "display exhibits" shown on the screens depicted in Figures 3A-3C. In this regard, Figure 3A shows a display which is designed "to illustrate, collectively or separately, the chromaticity and entirety of each video component colors red R, green G and blue B" while Figure 3B shows "a display of a cross-hatched type designed for adjustment of a preset video mode" wherein "such parameters as convergence or linearity characteristics of a CRT are provided, such that information about the CRT regarding this mode can be identified by the viewer" and in Figure 3C "a plurality of messages

required for an initial setting up of a video display screen are displayed in a sequential manner.” In the latter case, Kim provides that these messages can include “a message representing no connection between cable connector and a cable of external system” but no solution is displayed.

In responding to this argument, the Examiner states that certain passages of the Kim patent teach “ a video display capable of self diagnosis, wherein several pictorial representations are displayed on the screen to show the user whether the monitor is connected or disconnected so as to show the user the cause of the lack of picture.” As indicated above, Kim, at best, discloses that the messages provided include “a message representing no connection between cable connector and a table of external system” but clearly does not provide for any display of a solution.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gettemy and Petty et al (hereinafter “Petty”). This rejection is respectfully traversed. While the Petty patent discloses an apparatus wherein a plurality of status icons is selected and sequentially displayed for a predetermined time period, there is no teaching in Petty with respect to providing a graphical display of a solution for correcting a fault condition. Hence, claim 4 is patentable for at least the reasons set forth above in support of the patentability of parent claim 1.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Gettemy, Kim and Friesen. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Friesen patent merely discloses a microcomputer system with color coded components. This teaching is characterized in the Office Action as being of “color-coded cables being plugged into color-coded ports.” It is respectfully submitted

that there mere fact that color-coded cables have been plugged into color-coded ports in the prior art (something that Applicant freely admits) is not teaching of the subject matter of claim 7, i.e., there is no teaching in any of the references which would lead to providing a graphical depiction of a color-coded monitor cable being plugged into a color-coded connector. Given the actual teachings of Friesen and the other references the rejection here is clearly the improper product of hindsight. Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable for this reason as well as the reasons set forth above in support of parent claim 1.

Finally, claims 20-27 are patentable for similar reasons to those discussed above, with claim 20 reciting, *inter alia*, means for displaying on a display a pictographical solution for providing a proper connection with a connector in the event that a detecting means detects that a proper connection is not made with the conductor, while claim 26 recites means for displaying on a display an icongraphical depiction for a user a solution with which the user can cause a proper connection to be made with a connector disposed in the housing including the display.” It is respectfully submitted that, for at least some of the same reasons that were set forth above, these claims are clearly patentable over the cited references.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

**END REMARKS**